REMARKS

I. Prosecution History.

Claims 1-78 were originally submitted for examination with filing of the present nonprovisional patent application, which claims priority to provisional patent application 60/214,339 filed June 27, 2000. Four groups of claims were identified in a four-way restriction, of which Applicant selected Group I, Claims 1-31, for examination. Claims 32-78 remain withdrawn from examination.

In the first Office Action, the elected claims, 1-31, were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a). More particularly, Claims 1 - 11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,625,580 (hereinafter referred to as "Tayama"), while Claims 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tayama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,076.167 issued to Borza (hereinafter referred to as "Borza"), and 13 and 15-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tayama in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,360.101 issued to Irvin (hereinafter referred to as "Irvin"). In response, the applicant amended Claims 1-2, 4-9, 13-19, 22, 25-32; and added new claims 79-104.

In the second Office Action dated 8/12/04, made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 30, 31, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85-86, 89-93 and 98-105 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Eldridge et al*. Claims 5, 87 95 and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* et al in view of *Kaplan*. Claims 6-9, 13, 15-20,22-24,26,28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer et al*. Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Challener et al*. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer*, and further in view of *Borza*. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Ronen*. Claims 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view

of *Boyle*. Claims 88 and 94 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Magro et al*. Claims 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer*, and further in view of *Magro*. Claims 25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer*, and further in view of *Kaplan*. Finally, claim 97 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Kaplan*, and further in view of *Magro*.

An RCE was filed by Applicant on January 12, 2005 together with a preliminary amendment in response to the Final Office Action. In the preliminary amendment, claims 5, 25-29, 83-87, 95, 96 and 103 were cancelled and claims 1, 7, 8, 15-19, 30, 31 79 and 100 were amended. Claims 1-4, 7-24, 30, 31, 79-82, 88-94, 97-102, and 104-105 remained pending in the application. Claims 32-78 remained withdrawn.

A First Office Action following the RCE filing is dated April, 22, 2005 was received. In the official action claims 1-4, 6-9, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 30, 31, 79, 80, 82, 89-93, 98-102, 104 and 105 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer*. Claims 10 and 21 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer* and further in view of *Challener* et al. Claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer* further in view of *Magro* et al. Claims 12 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge in view of Cromer further in view of *Borza* et al. Claims 14 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer* further in view of *Ronen* et al. Claims 81 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Eldridge* in view of *Cromer* further in view of *Boyle* et al.

In response to the First office action, claims 4-6, 13, 24-29, 79-87, 95-96 and 101-104 were cancelled by Applicant. Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-12, 14-16, 30, 97 and 100. New claims 106-112 were added.

In response to the Amendment to the first office action, a Second Official Action, made FINAL, was been rendered on November 23, 2005. Claims 1-3,

7-12, 14-23, 30, 31, 88-94, 97-100 and 105-117 were rejected under the Second Office action. References cited to reject the claims under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 include Yocoub (US Published Application 2003/0011805) and Eldridge et al (US Patent 6,515,988).

In response to the Final Rejection, on February 23, 2006 Applicant filed and amendment to the claims and presented remarks distinguishing the cited art from the claims. On 3/27/2006 an advisory action was issued by the Examiner indicating that amendments would not be entered.

On April 21, 2006, Applicant filed another RCE and included the un-entered amendment from 2/23/2006 as his submission with the RCE.

On July 17, 2006, a first office action was rendered by the Examiner. Under the first office action, claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-20, 22, 23, 30, 31, 89-93, 98-100, 105-107, 112, 113 and 115-117 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,630) in view of Robertson (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047441). Claims 10, 21 and 114 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Robertson and further in view of Challener et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,297). Claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer et al in view of Robertson and further in view of Magro et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,078). Claim 14 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer et al in view of Robertson and further in view of Ronen (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0156708). Claims 108-111 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer et al in view of Robertson and further in view of Yacoub et al (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011805). Applicant submit a response and amendment on November 20, 2006 in response to the official action. The intent of the amendments were clarifying in nature and should finally distinguish Applicant's invention from cited references of record.

In a Final office action dated February 22, 2007, claims 1, 15, 30 and 100 stand objected to; claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-20, 22, 23, 30, 31, 89-93, 98-100, 105-113 and 115-117 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Haartsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,266); claims 10, 21 and 114 stand

rejected as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Haartsen and further in view of Challener et al; and claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Theimer in view of Haartsen and further in view of Magro et al.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, 30 and 100 to overcome the objection. Reconsideration of the claims is now respectfully requested given the following remarks.

II. Features of the Invention Summarized.

The present invention as claims enables handheld wireless device users to request assistance from public wireless communications network resources (e.g., wireless telecommunications) to locate a publicly accessible data rendering devices, such as video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, that has not previously been assigned to the WD and are physically located in a publicly location that is accessible to the wireless device user. DRDs in accordance with the teaching of Applications invention are truly public in that their location is made available to unassigned mobile wireless device users but must be located with the help of public wireless communications equipment and associated networks.

Another important feature of the present invention is that wireless device users can use their WD and supporting network resources to locate a DRD based on the WD's geographic location and/or a user profile

WD users can request the public wireless network resource supporting the WD to transfer data to the DRD over networks. The data associated with the wireless device can be obtained from memory or a mailbox associated with the wireless device user and accessible by the network supporting the WD.

Yet another important feature of the present invention is that wireless devices can be used to: control unassigned, user accessible data rendering device; manipulate data after it is transferred to the unassigned user accessible data rendering device before or during data rendering; and check the

operational readiness of data rendering devices before or during data rendering.

Public data networks and servers (e.g., telecommunications provider equipment) can be utilized to coordinate data rendering device location based on wireless device location, delivery of data to data rendering devices, and access to data rendering devices. Pass codes and encryption can be used to permit the rendering of data at DRDs.

Applicant's claims as amended fully support the above-described methods and capabilities and are supported by the extensive specification submitted by Applicant.

III. Summary of References Cited against independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106.

Applicant believes it would be helpful to summarize and characterize the newest primary references, *Theimer et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,630) in view of Robertson (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047441), which are being cited against all of his claims. *Theimer* and *Robertson* are both required to support the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections against all of the pending claims; yet neither actually teach or suggest the key inventive aspects claimed by Applicant.

Theimer et al.

Theimer et al ("*Theimer*") is directed at a system for identifying the spatial relationship of devices before the transfer of digital information is enabled between "spatially localizable" electronic devices (including portable devices). Theimer uses a supporting close range optical system to determine spatial relationships between devices. Theimer's devices are not *"Public" but are actually devices that are dedicated to each other in a common work environment*. As taken directly from Theimer's patent:

to direct transmission of business card data to all PDA's in a specified spatial location, in a specified radius or area, or even to specified rooms in a building.

Accordingly, what is needed is a system capable of determining spatial location of other electronic devices, and transmitting or receiving data only to specified electronic devices based on spatial location or orientation of those electronic devices. Preferably, a range of spatial locations and orientations can be specified, with transmission to adjacent electronic devices, to all electronic devices in a room, to all electronic devices in a particular orientation or direction, or even to all electronic devices at spatial locations within a specified range (e.g. within two meters). In terms of user interface, the present invention advantageously allows a user of a portable electronic device to interact more intuitively with other portable devices based on their perceived physical, spatial location, rather than on a logical location defined by their network address or name.

A user of the electronic devices (e.g., located within the same room) can "define electronic data transfers between portable electronic devices in user determined spatial locations with submeter precision." By admission in *Theimer's* Abstract, Specification and even as illustrated in figures 1 and 2, *the user does not need or teach the use of public wireless communications network assistance to help a WD and its user find electronic devices*. In fact, the exact location of devices is known. Theimer define them spatially for communications purposes, which is taught throughout *Theimer*. *Theimer* actually suggests that its features are most evidently advantageous when used in submeter applications **("within two meters")** and shows examples within the same physical space (i.e., a room) where IR transmitters and CCD cameras enable highly precise spatial location of tagged electronic devices.

Haartsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,266)

Haartsen is cited in combination with *Theimer* to reject independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106.

Haartsen teaches a communications system using Bluetooth wireless to discover wireless devices and determine their capabilities. Column 13 lines 15-18 are cited:

> In yet another aspect of the invention, the base station, or any other central device to which the wireless terminals can be locked, can assist in the search for services. In the Bluetooth system, wireless devices can carry out an inquiry procedure to discover which other Bluetooth units (portable or fixed) are in range and what their capabilities and services are (like printing, cellular telephony, PSTN telephony, projector, etc.). The inquiry procedure can also be a lengthy

Haartsen only teaches the ability to use Bluetooth wireless technology to discover and identify devices (such as a projector) in close proximity to a wireless device adapted with the Bluetooth technology. Bluetooth is known to be a short range wireless communications. Bluetooth is not a wireless communications system or network, e.g., cellular communications. *Haartsen*, however, does not enable Theimer to accomplish location of public data rendering devices using wireless communications systems and networks.

IV. Independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106 -- There is no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of utilizing wireless communications network resources to help wireless device user locate publicly accessible data rendering devices.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-20, 22, 23, 30, 31, 89-93, 98-100, 105-107, 112, 113 and 115-117 stand rejected. Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Theimer et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,630) in view of *Haartsen* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,266). Independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106 are included in this rejection and are the main focus of these remarks. Independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106 are rewritten as amended below with some key features of Applicant's claimed invention underlined:

> 1. A method of brokering data between handheld wireless devices and publicly available data rendering devices, comprising:
>
> selecting data from a handheld wireless device (WD) for rendering at a publicly available data rendering device (DRD), said DRD further comprising at

least one of a video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, and said DRD having a location not yet known by the WD;

providing a request to locate at least one DRD from said WD to a network resource including a public wireless network communications hardware and an associated public wireless communications network adapted for supporting wireless hand held devices, wherein said request is for said network resource to locate at least one DRD including a requirement that location be in accordance with a combination of said WD's geographic location and a WD user profile associated with said WD;

said network resource locating at least one DRD located near said WD and matching said WD user profile;

said network resource identifying to said WD at least one DRD located near said WD and matching said WD user profile to said WD in response to said request; and

selecting a DRD with said WD; and

transferring said data from at least one of said WD and said network resource to said DRD for rendering from memory associated with the WD.

15. A method of brokering data between a wireless device (WD), said WD supported by public wireless communications network resources including public wireless network communications hardware and associated communications networks, and a publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD), said DRD further comprising at least one of a video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, wherein said DRD is not assigned to the WD and is publicly accessible to WD users, wherein a WD user performs the following steps at said WD:

selecting data with said WD to render at a DRD;

entering a DRD locator request with said WD to said public wireless communications network resources to find at least one DRD located near the WD, said locator request including WD location information;

receiving DRD location information at said WD for the at least one DRD located near the WD, wherein said DRD's location information is based on said WD location information;

selecting a DRD with said WD for rendering said data; and

requesting at said WD that said data be transferred to said DRD through said public wireless communications network resources.

30. A method of brokering data between wireless devices and publicly accessible data rendering devices, comprising enabling a user of a wireless device to perform the following steps:

using a wireless device (WD) to request support from public wireless network communications hardware and an associated public wireless communications network adapted for supporting said WD to locate at least one publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD) further comprising at least one of a video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, said DRD not previously being assigned to said WD and being physically accessible to a WD user of said WD, said locating executed by said public wireless network communications hardware and associated public wireless communications network in accordance with a WD user profile located in at least one of said WD, said public wireless network communications hardware and associated public wireless communications network and based on the geographic location of said WD;

receiving DRD location information at the WD for the at least one DRD located near the WD;

selecting a DRD with said WD for rendering data;

selecting data with said WD for rendering at the DRD; and

providing said data, at the request of said WD via said public wireless network communications hardware and associated public wireless communications network supporting said WD, to said DRD for rendering.

100. A method using public wireless network communications hardware and an associated public wireless communications network adapted for supporting wireless hand held device users in brokering data between handheld wireless devices and publicly available data rendering devices, steps of the method carried out by a hand held wireless device user comprising:

providing a request to a network resource to locate a publicly available data rendering device (DRD) further comprising at least one of a video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, said DRD for rendering the data, said request provided through a hand held wireless device (WD) and a public wireless communications network supporting wireless communication by said WD to a network resource adapted for providing

assistance to hand held wireless devices in locating DRDs by determining the WD's geographic location, locating at least one DRD located near said WD based on its geographic location and identifying at least one DRD to said WD;

receiving location information at said WD from the network resource through said public wireless communications network supporting wireless communication by said WD, said location information identifying at least one DRD located near the WD's geographic location as determined by the network resource;

selecting one DRD using said WD;

selecting data for rendering at said DRD using said WD; and

transferring said data using said WD to said DRD for rendering.

106. A location based service method using public wireless communications network resources to assist a user of a GPS-enabled hand held wireless device supported by the public wireless communications network to locate a publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD) comprising at least one of a video monitor, an Internet Kiosk, a multimedia projector, or an ATM machine, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a GPS-enabled hand held wireless device at a public wireless communications network resource for assistance in locating a publicly accessible DRD;

said public wireless communications network resource determining the GPS-enabled hand held wireless device's geographic location using GPS information provided from the GPS-enabled hand held wireless device;

said public wireless communications network resource using the GPS-enabled hand held wireless device's geographic location to locate at least one publicly accessible DRD located near the GPS-enabled hand held wireless device; and

said public wireless communications network resource identifying the at least one publicly accessible DRD including its geographic and physical location to the GPS-enabled hand held wireless device.

Theimer in combination with Haartsen, does not teach or suggest the use of public communications networks resources to help a wireless device user to locate publicly accessible data rendering devices, such as multimedia projectors, Kiosks, ATMs or video monitors, which is what is taught in Applicant's independent claims 1, 15, 30, 100 and 106. It has been made very clear in Applicant's specification and his independent claims that the location is not yet known by the WD or its user. Theimer's admitted strength is in knowing/determining the spatial relationship between devices using infrared or CCD camera systems, as taught in column 5 of Theimer:

> As those skilled in the art will appreciate, a key aspect of the present invention is use of a mechanism for quickly and efficiently determining the spatial location of electronic devices with submeter scale precision. For best results, millimeter scale location systems can be used, although centimeter scale absolute position location ordinarily suffices for many data transfer applications. FIG. **2** is an example of a system **10** for precisely locating infrared signal sources **45** (infrared tags) with centimeter or less scale precision. The system **10** includes multiple CCD video cameras **25** positioned in room **12**. These video cameras **25** may have a fixed view, such as CCD video cameras **20**, **21**, **22**, and **62**, or they may have a movable view such as provided by movable CCD video camera **24**. Infrared signal sources **45** suitable for spatial localization can be positioned on static or essentially immovable objects such as walls (tags **51**, **40**, **41**, and **42**), or desks (tag **44**) to help define spatial boundaries and regions. Infrared signal sources **45** can also be positioned on readily movable objects such as a portable electronic device **70** (tag **72**) or device **74** (tag **76**). Image processing for spatial localization and data utilizes a computer system, in this example illustrated by a computer system **60**. The computer system **60** can of course be located outside room **12**, and there is no special requirement for any local computer process control. The computer system is connected by wireless or wired links to video cameras **25**, and may be stand-alone or connected to a computer network for distributing image processing duties and allowing for high speed data transfer.
>
> The present system **10** advantageously utilizes emitted infrared signals that are invisible to the human eye yet easily visible to CCD cameras **25**. After suitable image processing, the emitted infrared signals from multiple infrared tags provide three dimensional spatial localization for each of those multiple infrared tags. The emitted infrared signals are typically intermittent point source flashes of infrared light (infrared blinks) that appear, along with the visual light image, on frames of CCD video cameras. Since the cameras

By contrast, an important features behind applicant's invention is in the inventors system being able to locate a publicly available DRD using the support of wireless communications systems and networks. Location can be based on wireless device location and a user profile.

The *Theimer* disclosure actually teaches away from Applicant's invention as claimed because the user or system in Theimer actually knows the physical location because all devices taught in Theimer are in the same room and Theimer's invention merely wishes to optimize or secure the transfer of data between them. Theimer makes not actual reference to user profile use even though col. 1, lines 57-65, and col. 4, lines 42-62 are cited for this. Theimer enables user selection of certain nearby devices and suppression of others based on spatial relationships. Theimer uses optical systems to determine spatial relationships between devices before data is exchanged.

By adding Bluetooth wireless communications capabilities to Theimer, *Haartsen* does not extend *Theimer's* teachings in a manner that obviates the invention claimed by Applicant. *Haartsen* offers a very capable module for enabling radio communications between wireless devices; but all that *Haartsen* teaches is the use of a communications standard – a capability that would reside within a portable and stationary device only to support data communications. A communication module supporting the Bluetooth standard that can manage the transfer of data from/to wireless devices with electronic data systems like, Kiosks, computers, network servers, etc, but does not enable *Theimer* in a manner that would suggest to the skilled in the art a systems or methods using public communications network resources to help a wireless device user to locate publicly accessible data rendering devices, such as multimedia projectors, Kiosks, ATMs or video monitors, whose location is not yet known by the WD or its user.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-59, lines 61-63, and col. 4 lines 55-58 as for teaching that a DRD renders a document only after a render command is provided to the DRD through the PDA. This proposition was not found in the cited location of Theimer.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-59, col.2, lines 61-63, and col. 4 lines 55-58 as for teaching that "a DRD renders a document only after a render command is provided to the DRD through the PDA." This proposition can not be found in the cited locations of Theimer.

Col.1, lines 57-59, merely states:

> operating PDA's. A user of a first PDA would merely have to depress a button to initiate transfer of information to an adjacent second PDA, without specifically knowing himself

Col. 2, lines 61-63, merely states:

> device. For example, a command to transfer data to other electronic devices to the left of a particular user's electronic device is possible. As an additional advantage, use of two or

Col. 4, lines 55-58, merely states:

> 55 can merely depress an appropriate button, use a mouse to click a menu command such as "transfer adjacent", or other suitable initiating action, to initiate a data transfer to device 172. The system 100, operating with submeter precision, is

The transfer of data from one device to another is all that is described, not rendering by the second device once the data is received.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3 and 93, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-59, col. 2, lines 61-63, and col. 4 lines 55-58 for teaching that "the command inherently includes a passcode." As shown in the quoted section above, this again is a proposition can not found in the cited locations of Theimer.

Regarding the rejection of claim 7, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-59, col. 2, lines 61-63, and col. 4 lines 55-58 for teaching that "the data is rendered by the DRD after the render command is provided by a WD user on a user interface associated with the DRD." As with the above, this is again a proposition can not found in the cited locations of Theimer. Data transfer from one device to the other is all that is taught.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 61-65, for teaching that "the data is retrieved from a storage assigned to the WD user only after the WD user provides a passcode to the DRD." This part of Theimer reads as follows:

> identifying address information of the second PDA. A computer network capable of interacting with both PDA's through wireless links and storing spatial information concerning PDA location receives the information from the first PDA. determines which PDA is adjacent to the first user. and

There is no mention of a passcode here. This again is a proposition can not found in or supported by the cited text in Theimer.

Regarding the rejection of claim 9, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-59, col. 2, lines 61-63, and col. 4 lines 55-58 for teaching that "the passcode is provided to the DRD by the WD." This function is not found in the cited sections.

Regarding the rejection of claim 16, Theimer is cited at col. 1, lines 57-65 and col. 4 lines 42-52 for teaching that "the data is transferred to the DRD from the public wireless communications network resources following the request at the DRD" Applicant defines public wireless communications networks as telecommunications provider networks and equipment. Public wireless communications networks as defined by application include CDMA, TDMA, GPRS, GSM, 3G networks. These are commonly referred to as cellular networks). These public wireless communications networks can be utilized by wireless devices in communications with and supported by the public wireless communications networks to coordinate data rendering device location based on wireless device location, delivery of data to data rendering devices, and access to data rendering devices. The use of, or mention of, a public wireless communication network as taught by application is not found in the cited sections.

Regarding claim 17, Theimer does not teach a public wireless communication network resource facilitating transfer of data to the DRD from a memory associated with the WD in the abstract, col. 4, lines 42-27, 52-66, or col. 5, lines 14-19.

The rejection of claim 18-20 is respectfully traversed for the same reasons provided by Applicant in support of claims 7-9.

The rejection of claim 22 and 23 is respectfully traversed for the same reasons provided by Applicant in support of claims 2 and 3.

The rejection of claims 31 and 105 is respectfully traversed fro the same reason provided by Applicant in support of claim 2.

Claims 2-3, 7-9 and 97-99 ultimately depend on claim 1, claims 14-20, 22 and 23 ultimately depend on claim 15, claims 31 and 89-93 ultimately depend on claim 30, claim 105 ultimately depends on claim 100, and claims 107, 112, 113 and 115-117 ultimately depend on claim 106. Therefore, claims 2-3, 7-9, 14-20, 22-23, 31, 89-93, 97-99, 105, 107, 112-113 and 115-117 overcome *Theimer* in combination with *Haartsen* for the reasons stated above.

Applicant believes his claims overcame the rejections of record. Applicant is confident that his claims are currently amended overcome the *Theimer* in combination with *Haartsen*, and his claims cover new and nonobvious methods and systems for assisting wireless device user to locate publicly accessible data rendering devices utilizes communications network resources, which is not taught, hinted at or suggested by the art.

Applicant believe the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, 15-20, 22, 23, 30, 31, 89-93, 98-100, 105-107, 112, 113 and 115-117 has been traversed and now respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims.

V. Rejection of Claims 10, 21, 114 as obvious over Thiemer in view of Haartsen and further in view of Challener.

Claims 10, 21 and 114 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Theimer* in view of *Robertson* and further in view of

Challener et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed because claim 10 is dependent on claim 1, claim 21 is dependent on claim 15 and claim 114 is dependent on claim 106. Theimer in view of Roberson and in view of *Challener* does not teach using public wireless communications network resources to assist wireless device supported by the public wireless communications network to locate a publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD).

VI. Rejection of Claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 as obvious over Thiemer in view of Haartsen and further in view of Magro et al.

Claims 11, 88, 94 and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Theimer* in view of *Robertson* and further in view of *Magro* et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed because claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, claims 88 and 94 are dependent on claim 30, and claim 97 is dependent on claim 1. Theimer in view of Roberson and in view of *Magro* does not teach using public wireless communications network resources to assist wireless device supported by the public wireless communications network to locate a publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD).

VII. Rejection of Claim 14 as obvious over Thiemer in view of Haartsen and further in view of Ronen (US pub. 2002/0156708).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Theimer* in view of *Robertson* and further in view of *Ronen*. The rejection is respectfully traversed because claim 14 is dependent on claim 1. Theimer in view of Roberson and in view of *Ronen* does not teach using public wireless communications network resources to assist wireless device supported by the public wireless communications network to locate a publicly accessible data rendering device (DRD).

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant submits that Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14-23, 30, 31, 88-94, 97-100, 105-117, which remain pending in the application, are patentably distinct over and not obviated by the references ob record, and further that the claims are in allowable form. Accordingly, the applicants earnestly solicit the favorable consideration of his application, and respectfully request that it be passed to issue in its present condition.

Should the Examiner discern any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of the aforementioned claims that might be resolved or overcome with the aid a telephone conference, he is cordially invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2007

Luis M. Ortiz
Applicant/Patent Attorney
Registration Number 361,230
ORTIZ & LOPEZ, PLLC
P.O. Box 4484
Albuquerque, NM 87196-4484
Tel. (505) 314-1311
Email: lortiz@olpatentlaw.com